Annex IV: Country Information

Each of the reports is based on a combination of data derived from the following sources:

- Interviews with 2 respondents-HRAW leaders or informed observers of NGO landscape from a particular country. In total 21 interviews were held during February, March, April 2010 with respondents from 10 countries. Each interview was recorded and transcribed without attribution;
- Research of literature, publications and reports on the NGO sustainability, situation in the area of human rights, accountability and watchdog as well as about funding of NGOs;
- Web-search of sites of HRAWs and donor organizations relevant to the subject of the study.

At the beginning of each report we provide a summary of key human rights, accountability and watchdog issues that are relevant for a given country. These are based on various reports of international and domestic organizations that monitor the situation. The list of issues provides a context for the need of activities performed by the HRAWs. The list of selected HRAWs with their short description comes next and provides the reader with a sense of who are the major HRAW NGO actors in a given country. Lists are not exhaustive, but to some degree representative.

The next section in a country report looks at the sustainability situation of HRAWs and presents the key challenges and issues that these organizations face. The information in this section is based mostly on the analysis of conducted interviews.

The final section deals with the funding sources, both existing and potential ones and analyzes them from the perspective of HRAWs.

Given a very heterogeneous and to some extent incomplete information, it was not possible to formulate conclusions for each country, however for some countries we offer summary of findings and conclusions, especially when the available data allowed us to do so.

Each report also includes the list of resources and publications used, a list of HRAW web addresses and list of respondents without identification.

4.1 Hungary

1. Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog Context

Concerning HRAW NGOs, besides several changes in funding and legislation, the most crucial change is related to the political context in Hungary. The essentially critical nature of these organizations lead to Fidesz declaring them their allies during the term of the previous government. TASZ and the Helsinki Committee were critical e.g. because of the use of force by the police during the demonstrations back in 2006, and in turn Fidesz referred to the warnings about the alarming level of corruption and publicity of public information watched by NGOs. However, as Fidesz won and formed the new government in 2010, those alliances were broken and ignored and the Hungarian right has redefined its relation to the civic organizations and HRAW NGOs in particular. From the point of view of Fidesz there are two groups of NGOs. The first bracket contains all those which are constantly allied with the party, that is, they are bandwagon organizations which represent the interest of the party and basically are governed by the party. These may be labelled “tainted NGOs”, as they are not committed to issues which are represented against any political course but very well the other way around: they are committed to political organizations and
represent issues only when they help that particular party. E.g. a few months after Fidesz took power a president of the National Civil Fund (NCA), the money distributing governmental funds to civic organizations was appointed. Laszlo Csizmadia, the appointed president was the leader of the Forum of Civic Alliance, an umbrella organization of civic organizations committed to Fidesz that gained publicity courtesy of demonstrations against the socialist government and especially against Ferenc Gyurcsány, the former Prime Minister. (Note that a few weeks ago, the Forum of Civic Alliance was the organizer of the pro-government demonstration “Peace March”, a demonstration aimed at the European publicity and the Hungarian opposition, with an intention to express that there are masses behind Fidesz in spite of fierce attacks on its policies. The demonstration had strong anti-EU tones, the slogan was “we won’t be a colony”.

The other bracket contains real NGOs for which issues come first; therefore, their conflicts with governments are independent of the current political course. The latter group is the one which served as a temporary ally for Fidesz before 2010 when it was about criticizing the socialist government, and which has become an enemy for the new government formed by Fidesz itself in 2010. Any criticism coming from this group and these NGOs is rebutted as representing left-wing and/or liberal interest, these notions are even backed by theories of international conspiracy against Hungary. The government led by Viktor Orbán does not understand, and does not approve of the viewpoints of HRAW NGOs. The criticism on the new constitution (its way of approval and its partisan content), the “reformed” judiciary (its diminishing independence), the new media law (the newly established authority over media contents, the restriction on freedom of the press) and especially the mutilation of the constitutional court, are issues about which HRAW NGOs are deeply concerned. However, their criticism was defined as being politically biased and motivated, in the interest of the left-wing opposition in the parliament along with the liberal (media)elite of Europe and the international banker elite that was angered because of the extra burdens put on foreign banks.

Besides the fundamental breaches in the rule of law and constitutional checks and balances under the Fidesz government, the human rights situation in Hungary has been worsening in the last several years, especially in the area of anti-Roma extremist violence and harsh rhetoric against ethnic and religious minority groups. Extremists increasingly targeted Roma, resulting in the deaths of nine Roma and multiple injuries to others a few years ago. Discrimination against Roma in education, housing, employment, and access to social services continued. After 2010 the Roma became the scapegoat for abusing state-run subsidies, and they are targeted by the communal work program launched by the new government after 2010.

The election in 2010 had yet another important outcome: Jobbik was elected into the parliament, and explicit anti-Roma rhetorics employed by the party moved into upper-level politics as a consequence. Through the lack of a significant level of immigrants, Roma became the main target group of racial/ethnic hatred and welfare chauvinism, of which Jobbik is the main beneficiary.

Other human rights problems reported included:

- Police use of excessive force against suspects, particularly Roma;
- Government corruption, non-transparent decision making;

---

1 For example, on February 23, 2009 extremists shot dead a 27-year-old Roma and his 5 year old son as they ran from their burning home in Eastern Hungary. The family tried to escape from their house which was set on fire. Cserbá's wife and two children suffered from severe burns. In August of the same year a Romani women was shot dead in the village Kislétta in Eastern Hungary.
• Societal violence against women and children;
• Sexual harassment of women and trafficking in persons.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people continued to experience intolerance from violent groups. There was a rise in support for the Magyar Gárda (Hungarian Guard), a radical right-wing organization, which is primarily anti-Roma and has demonstrated against what they describe as “Roma criminality”. The Municipal Court of Budapest ruled that this group should be disbanded as it “means to create a climate of fear, while its activities – the marching of its members in Roma-populated settlements and the speeches of its leaders – constitute a breach of the rights of other citizens”. However, the ban on the Guard did not abolish the actual phenomenon: similar uniforms along with similar groups without any claim of official status whatsoever continued to threaten Roma communities in villages far away from the capital. Moreover, local governments run by Jobbik hired former members of the Guard to launch security services in order to protect local population from – as they call it – “Gypsy crime”.

There were some attempts by civil society to counter the worrying rise in right-wing radicalism and the Guard’s popularity. Some of these efforts were genuine grassroots initiatives, while others, like the Demokratikus Charta (Democratic Charter), were projects closely associated with the previous government and viewed by many as inauthentic and politically partisan. It is true that the Guard-phenomenon was a politically useful issue for left-wing parties (or, at least, they deemed it useful), and after the fall of the socialist government, regular news about atrocities disappeared from the media, but the remnants of the Guard are still present and are intimidating the Roma.

One of the key problems in Hungary, similarly as in other countries of the region is corruption. While the phenomenon of corruption in Hungary is frequently discussed in media and political debates, it is not as pervasive as in Romania or Bulgaria, that are the regional „leaders“ spread of corruption. This is indicated also by the ranking of Hungary in the TI CPI index in which Hungary is in the middle of list regarding the Visegrad countries lagging behind Poland, Estonia and Slovenia. Alternatively, corruption remains an important media topic, political issue and everyday experience. Besides small-scale corruption, there are cases of large-scale white-collar corruption that are known, but have not been prosecuted. The courts have already taken some smaller cases before the election, while others are still being investigated.

The global financial crisis has severely affected Hungary, which, in combination with its fiscal policies of last decade, ended at the risk of collapse of public finance and assistance from the IMF was needed in 2009. The new government of Viktor Orbán that have taken office in June 2010 faced a major challenge of stabilizing the public funding and taking down the public debt that is at 80% of the country’s GDP. As a result, despite its rhetoric, the government implemented major social welfare restrictions and poverty has been increasing. The government attempts to benefit from the corruption cases related to the socialists and to counterweight the negative effects of governmental mismanagement and austerity measures. However, there is a more and more public discussion about the financial background of this government as well,

---

4 Nations in Transit 2009 (Freedom House)
5 http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/#CountryResults
6 Mr. Zuschlag, a former parliamentarian of socialist party MSZP, and more than a dozen associates were accused of creating fictitious non-governmental organizations in the mid-90s to embezzle subsidies totaling 75 million forints ($356,800). The amount was used to finance political campaigns and party events, and part of it was spent privately. He was sentenced for 8,5 years by a court, in a quite harsh ruling in March 2010. Source: The Wall Street Journal, April 6, 2010.
which poses new risks, such as disillusionment and the growing support of the presumed clean-handed radicals.

2. Key Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog NGOs

Hungary, especially Budapest has been a seat of several international human rights organizations related to Soros Network or some other foreign networks or actors that were active in the CEE region, not only in Hungary (USAID, Freedom House). Some of them are listed also here among other NGOs that focus specifically on Hungary. There are several HRAW NGOs that are institutionally developed and structured, but their number has been decreasing in last ten years, as the foreign funding, which they used, has decreased as well. Some of the most active today are listed below.

- The Hungarian Civil Liberties Union (HCLU / TASZ) is a non-profit human rights watchdog NGO established in Budapest, Hungary in 1994. HCLU is a law reform and legal defence public interest NGO in Hungary, working independently of political parties, the state or any of its institutions. HCLU’s aim is to promote the case of fundamental rights and principles laid down by the Constitution of the Republic of Hungary and by international conventions. Generally it has the goal of building and strengthening the civil society and rule of law in Hungary and the CEE region. HCLU gets financial resources mostly from foundations, but the share of its income that is generated from members and sympathizers as well as individual donors increases.7

- Transparency International (TI), Hungary. In order to remedy the situation regarding the corruption in Hungary a volunteer work group was set up, becoming Transparency International's official contact partner in Hungary in August 2006. Their goal is to contribute to mitigating corruption, promoting transparency and accountability in the public sphere of decision-making processes as well as allocation of public funds, moreover to improving accessibility of public interest information.8

- Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC) is an association founded in 1989. The Hungarian Helsinki Committee monitors the enforcement in Hungary of human rights enshrined in international human rights instruments, provides legal defence to victims of human rights abuses by state authorities and informs the public about rights violations. The HHC strives to ensure that domestic legislation guarantee the consistent implementation of human rights norms. The HHC promotes legal education and training in fields relevant to its activities, both in Hungary and abroad. The HHC's main areas of activities are centred on protecting the rights of asylum seekers and foreigners in need of international protection, as well as monitoring the human rights performance of law enforcement agencies and the judicial system. It particularly focuses on the conditions of detention and the effective enforcement of the right to defence and equality before the law.9

- NANE is a women’s rights organization established in 1994. It advocates legal and public administration reforms for victims of domestic violence. It carried out a number of successful public campaigns including petition of the Constitutional Court to admit marital rape as a crime. NANE is the only NGO in Hungary running a hotline for battered women and children in Hungary. It is successful in its public campaigning through various media sources, printed and electronic. NANE carries out research and training activities10.

---

7 http://tasz.hu/en
8 http://www.transparency.hu/en
9 http://helsinki.hu
10 http://www.nane.hu/
Legal Defense Bureau for National and Ethnic Minorities (NEKI). The Másság (Otherness) Foundation was established in 1993 with the purpose to operate the Legal Defense Bureau for National and Ethnic Minorities (NEKI). NEKI's legal activities include strategic litigation and free of charge legal aid service. A case is considered a strategic one if it could be capable of developing anti-discrimination law or legal practice. Besides legal representation in concrete cases, NEKI deems it extremely important to contribute to the social dialogue on discrimination issues. It is in day-to-day correspondence with representatives of the press thus promoting such dialogue, informing the public and forming the attitude of the society towards a more positive direction.11

The Hungarian Center for Human Rights Defenders. (Magyar Emberi Jogvédo Kozpont Alpítvány)12 is a legal defense organization that provides legal help and social work, harm reduction and other kinds of assistance for people who need representation or assistance such as asylum seekers, migrants or otherwise disadvantaged groups.

There is also a number of civic initiatives and NGOs that organize public protests to oppose the far right extremism and neo-nazi movements, such as Magyar Antirasszista Alapítvány13, Hungarians Against the Nazis, Solidarity Against Violence, Democratic Network, Green Left, the Civilians Against the Extreme Right, and others.

In addition, a number of regional human rights organizations are based in Budapest, the most important ones being:

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) is an international public interest law organization engaging in a range of activities aimed at combating anti-Romani racism and human rights abuse of Roma. The approach of the ERRC involves, in particular, strategic litigation, international advocacy, research and policy development, and human rights training of Romani activists. Since its establishment in 1996, the ERRC has endeavoured to give Roma the tools necessary to combat discrimination and win equal access to government, education, employment, health care, housing and public services. The ERRC works to combat prejudice and discrimination against Roma, and to promote genuine equality of treatment and equality of respect.14

The Mental Disability Advocacy Center (MDAC) is an international human rights organization which advances the rights of children and adults with intellectual disabilities and psycho-social disabilities. MDAC promotes equality and social inclusion through strategic litigation, advocacy, research and monitoring and capacity-building. MDAC operates at the global level as well as regional and domestic levels in Europe and Africa. MDAC is headquartered in Budapest, Hungary and was registered as a foundation in 2002. The Open Society Foundations (OSF) founded MDAC and continues to be one of its donors. MDAC has participatory status with the Council of Europe. In 2011 MDAC was granted a special consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council. 15

The Public Interest Law Institute (PILI) is an international NGO that advances human rights around the world by stimulating public interest advocacy and developing the institutions necessary to sustain it. Public interest law encompasses activities such as campaigning, strategic litigation, legal aid, clinical legal education, legal literacy and other public education programs. PILI's approach is

11 http://www.neki.hu
12 http://www.mejok.hu
13 http://www.maraalapitvany.hu/
14 http://www.errc.org
15 http://mdac.info/en
to develop and support the diverse array of organizations, programs and individuals involved in these activities and united by a common sense of mission: strengthening the use of law as an instrument for achieving social justice. In doing so, public interest law activities apply principles of human rights, democracy, open society and the rule of law.\(^{16}\)

3. Situation of the HRAW NGOs and their Sustainability

According to the latest available USAID NGO Sustainability Index (2010),\(^{17}\) the situation has only slightly changed compared to 2009. However, since then, NGOs are facing a completely new legal, political and financial context. Regarding 2008 already, the USAID report described the Hungarian NGOs as facing the crisis in a weakened condition, after several years of financial difficulties. Income from all sources is decreasing and many key NGOs are near bankruptcy (this is specifically related to their EU funding which is complicated by demanding financial management rules).

„Accountability and transparency are decreasing, and innovation is stifled. Due to the financial crisis, the government has been increasing bureaucratic requirements in order to create ways to reject funding for NGO projects and reduce the budget. While this is not a new issue, the financial crisis has worsened the situation. Government requirements placed on NGOs are sometimes harsher than the average EU requirements."\(^{18}\)

A specific feature of Hungarian NGO sector is its relatively large dependency on public funding, which originated since late nineties, when the Hungarian government had taken an active role and strategy towards the support of NGO sector. (Some observers consider it as being too supportive). This was also reflected in the rise of public funding allocated for NGOs since 2000 that includes support for service provision and funds provided through various calls for proposals\(^{19}\). The human rights, accountability and watchdog NGOs were also eligible to access public funding. Research conducted in 2005 in Hungary by Scsaurszki – Sebestyen brought evidence that watchdog, advocacy and policy NGOs received significant amount of public funds in 2003, similarly as was the average for the whole NGO sector\(^{20}\). This situation might have changed since then, however, there is still significant public funding in Hungary for NGOs and the perceptions from the field are that most of the existing HRAW NGOs are still primarily funded by public funding besides international funding.\(^{21}\)

The dependency of NGOs on public funding, according to one interpretation, meant also that there was a stagnation among NGOs who were interested in securing their limited but available resources and were not motivated in raising funding from the private sector or through other means. So NGOs maintained their status quo, for which the public funding was sufficient, however did not move any further in their resource generation and sustainability. This trend, together with the decrease of foreign funding, meant especially for watchdog, human rights or accountability NGOs a gradual decline of their profile and their shrinking as a specific sub-group of NGOs. On the organizational level, the HRAWs only slowly develop their relations with traditional media and rarely use new social media (facebook, internet fundraising, telemarketing, etc.)

\(^{16}\) http://www.pili.org
\(^{18}\) USAID 2008 NGO Sustainability Index
\(^{19}\) This also includes the National Civic Fund as well as mechanism of 1% tax. NCF has been replaced by a new mechanism since then. (see below)
\(^{21}\) Interview with respondent from the HRAW NGO, March 17, 2010
to strengthen their communication with public and save costs at the same time (in traditional advertising and marketing)\textsuperscript{22}.

There is a visible growth of grass-root groups and initiatives that can raise an issue and stay visible for a while, but cannot sustain their presence over a certain period and develop stronger structures. For example the recent elections (and the relative success of the new party\textsuperscript{23} that drew its support also from the civic sector) as well as the anti-racist gatherings in 2009 and 2010 showed the ability of Hungarian NGOs and civic initiatives to organize themselves for a joint action.

Another specific feature of the Hungarian HRAW NGOs segment is that the political divide in the country between the nationalists-populists-conservatives and pro-western liberals and social democrats also influences the NGOs. The conflicts between these two groupings in last few years have emphasized the issue of rights defense in Hungary.

\textit{“Most often one hears of NGOs not as shaping public policy but as representing victims of rights violations before courts or taking the government to court.”}\textsuperscript{24}

The strategic litigation and rights advocacy needs follow-up which needs capacities and resources and that are often missing. This is a common problem of many HRAWs in the CEE, not just in Hungary.

Many HRAW NGOs were actively advocating for the defense of political and to some extent human rights – such as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, access to justice and others. There were active NGOs on both sides of the political divide that advocated for their freedoms and rights, but from very different perspectives – one from a democratic one and the other from anti-democratic one. As one respondent characterized the situation:

\textit{“Some newly formed HR organizations related to the right-wing party often use the original legal defense, HR and watchdog toolkits for anti-democratic purposes”}\textsuperscript{25}

Because of that and of the rise of radical and conservative right in Hungary, the role of liberally oriented human rights NGOs will be rising in future, respondents said, and may even bring more support to them.

\textit{“The challenges will be how such support will be converted to resources”}\textsuperscript{26}

Concerning the new political context created by the change in power in 2010, and the related two-third majority in parliament, it is important to note that for NGOs the legal situation has significantly worsened. Financial possibilities have narrowed by the closure of bilateral funds such as the Norwegian Financing Mechanism, and the restructuring of the NCF (National Civil Fund) where payments were suspended immediately after the new government took power.

The parliament passed a new bill\textsuperscript{27} on civic organizations in 2011, surrounded by the objections of several NGOs. According to the legislation, it is an explicit goal to reduce subsidies for NGOs which applied only for the money but did not serve public or common interest. With that a narrowly redefined public benefit status

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} On the other hand there are just a few HRAW NGOs that are doing exceptionally well in this regard, e.g. TASZ, which embraced social media and uses it to generate a lot of support. \hfill
\textsuperscript{23} The 2010 USAID report even describes both new parties in parliament - Jobbik and LMP - as originating from grass-roots organizations and thus representing a slight change in civic participation. Based on a more in-depth examination of the Hungarian context, however, they rather represent the politicization of the civic society. \hfill
\textsuperscript{24} Populist Politics and Liberal Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe (Grigorij Mesežnikov, IVO, Slovakia, 2008) \hfill
\textsuperscript{25} Interview with observer of HRAW situation on March 17, 2010 \hfill
\textsuperscript{26} Interview with HRAW NGO Director on February 22, 2010 \hfill
\textsuperscript{27} No. of bill: 2011/CLXXV
\end{flushright}
has become a decisive criterion. The control of NGOs over funding, aims, criteria and legislative context is declining, while control by the government has intensified. Besides, administrative aggravations were introduced, such as reporting for all NGOs (not only public benefit ones) and a renewed registration of all public benefit foundations and NGOs at the courts.

According to recent criticism, the aim and the intention behind these acts of legislation is to narrow the scope of the services and support of NGOs which do not comply with the political line of the government. The government-rhetoric supporting the reform is based on the supposed idleness of NGOs and any criticism is framed as coming from and supporting the opposition.

4. The Funding Situation for HRAW NGOs

Respondents we talked to during the project, believe that for HRAW NGOs in Hungary the majority of funding still consists of sources that are of foreign origin – be it international foundations such as OSI or CEE Trust or European sources.

Domestic sources represent only a small part of their income, and even that is raised with a great effort and energy. Some HRAW NGOs have already started to develop their constituencies through on-line fundraising using their social networks and Internet based communication and developing relationships with individuals that possess larger assets. But many more still remain in their traditional fundraising from institutions or foundations.

Domestic funding for HRAW NGOs is limited, similarly as in other countries of the region. The situation has not improved over the past several years, it rather deteriorated. The situation has become even worse with the new government on the one hand due to the enduring financial crisis and on the other hand due to the changed legal and political context. New local sources for HRAWs were not mobilized, unlike it was hoped for. Therefore many HRAW NGOs cannot imagine their future without government funding. This may even get worse in a few years given the grim outlook of public finances in Hungary after the fiscal crisis in 2010-2011 which may result in decreased domestic public funding for NGOs as such (as a part of public budget cuts).

The private giving culture develops very slowly. Most private corporate or individual giving is oriented towards social and health causes or for causes that are popular in media. Human rights or watchdog activities - being politically sensitive - are not among them. This applies also to the mechanism of 1% of income tax, which is allocated to recipients by individual taxpayers. The share of the human rights NGOs on the total funding available form the mechanism is perceived to be very small.

“...These issues (HRAW) unfortunately seem more sophisticated for ordinary Hungarian citizens, probably this is the reason why we are not on the top of the list. There are certain topics which are much more attractive for people. It is very hard to collect money from 1% for NGOs working with Roma or homeless people”

The potential for individual giving exists, but for HRAW NGOs it is developing slowly. An HRAW NGO that has experience with it reports:

“Increasingly we have Hungarian individuals who are donating to us: a few hundred people are donating something between 25 and 50 dollars a year and then we have a few people who are donating much more and then we have no more than five people who are donating between 20,000

28 Interview with observer of HRAW situation on March 17, 2010
and 30,000 USD a year. At the end of 2010 we would be happy if around 25% of our full budget would come from Hungarian individuals. But it is increasing.  

Membership development is also one of the strategies that is efficiently used by some NGOs:

“...We have a system which is called supporting members system and we do get some funding from them. You can become a supporting member even without paying but we encourage people to become paying supporting members. We don’t have a specific amount so a supporting member can pay 5,000 as well as 50,000 forints but what we encourage most are monthly donations so that every single month we would get some money from them.”

Corporate giving exists and grows. It is the view of NGOs we talked to, that it follows corporate purposes mostly (e.g., marketing, PR). Restrictions on incentives for private giving have been introduced since 2009 - the tax benefits were cut for donors and for the organizations, which received the donations. The donor also had to pay VAT after the donations but this has been abolished in 2011.

The National Civic Fund was considered as an ineffective mechanism for support of HRAW NGOs even when it was functioning, due to its internal design problems that are criticized from within the NGO sector (lack of strategic directions, conflicts of interests as NGOs sit on its boards and at the same time act as recipients, lack of vision and leadership and egalitarian mentality – small amounts are divided to almost everybody). As mentioned above, the current government has remodeled the Fund and cut back its budget significantly (it will distribute around 1 billion HUF each year instead of 7 billion); in addition, it is expected to fund the “loyal” organizations. Therefore this source is seen as not relevant for HRAW NGOs.

On the level of domestic funding, a major source is EU Structural Funds. These funds have been primarily oriented to support NGOs in their service provision function and as such these funds were not directly relevant for HRAW NGOs, although NGOs could take advantage of them (for example the Societal Renewal Operational Program which is especially oriented for developing human resources, local communities). Within its framework there were several sub-programs and calls for proposals that were available for NGOs. The major disadvantage of EU SF for NGOs is their administrative complexity that makes a great burden on NGO recipients. Many NGOs have taken loans to advance funding for Structural Funds contracts and later on got into payback problems due to delays in payments. Often they took second mortgages on their property, and sometimes board and staff members even took out personal loans. Moreover, according to the USAID 2010 report, EU agencies run by the government often withdraw funds, or demand total repay of them even in cases of minor failures, mostly due to the overbureaucratic administration.

Another important domestic source of funding, although originating outside of Hungary, was the Norwegian/EEA Financing Mechanism that ended in 2010. However, the Financial Mechanism of Swiss Confederation, intended to replace it did not start as the new government suspended the decision.

“The Norwegian fund was a success story in Hungary in the meaning that the topics were relevant, the implementing organization received many proposals. The advocacy, legal defense and human rights issues were among the priorities and these kinds of organizations could apply for certain projects. The only problem is that it was only temporary support and only for projects so it obviously would not solve the long-term sustainability problems. The fund was a model type of...”

---

29 Interview with HRAW NGO Director, February 22, 2010
30 Ibid.
31 Interview with HRAW NGO Director, February 22, 2010
32 USAID NGO Sustainability Report, Hungary, 2008
program in the meaning that the whole implementation was on-line and it was very quick compared with EU structural funds distribution.33

“The Swiss fund is in Hungary in the stage that they selected an implementing organization but everything has come to a standstill with the new government. Based on the priorities of the selected organization if and when it is launched it will also be relevant for the human rights NGOs.”34

A structural factor related to the funding situation of HRAWs in Hungary is the lack of domestic independent grantmaking foundations, which could provide seed money for new NGOs, bridge funding for NGOs grappling with cash-flow problems due to late payment by the state, and institutional support to advocacy and watchdog organizations.

From among the international sources of funding relevant for HRAWs the most used are the International grantmaking foundations (OSI, CEE Trust) that still fund important share of HRAWs activities in Hungary today. For example the Emergency fund from OSI provided support to key NGOs that were affected by the financial crisis. The funds from the European Commission are also available and are used by HRAWs to some extent. The administrative requirements and co-funding requirement (sometimes up to 40%) still do mean that these funds remain inaccessible for many HRAW NGOs.

4.2 Hungary: Sources

A. List of HRAWs (web contacts)

- The Hungarian Civil Liberties Union (HCLU / TASZ), http://tasz.hu/en
- The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), http://www.errc.org
- Demos Hungary Foundation, http://www.demos.hu
- The Public Interest Law Institute (PILI), http://www.pili.org
- Legal Defense Bureau for National and Ethnic Minorities (NEKI), http://www.neki.hu
- Nonprofit Information and Training Centre, http://www.niok.hu
- Political Capital, http://www.politicalcapital.hu

33 Interview with observer of HRAW situation on March 17, 2010
34 Ibid.
B. List of Respondents

- HRAW NGO, Director
- HRAW NGO Observer

C. Literature and Resources

3) Nations in Transit 2009 (Freedom House)
4) 2008 NGO Sustainability Index (USAID)
5) Populist Politics and Liberal Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe (Grigorij Mesežnikov, IVO, Slovakia, 2008)